

Environmental Assessment

Identification of Proposed Action

By application dated August 2, 1994, UW requested authorization to decontaminate and dismantle the UW research reactor, to dispose of its component parts in accordance with the proposed decommissioning plan, and to terminate Facility License No. R-73. The UW research reactor was shut down in June 1988, and has not operated since then. The reactor fuel was removed from the facility and shipped to a Department of Energy (DOE) facility as directed by the DOE in accordance with DOE, NRC, and Department of Transportation requirements.

Opportunity for a hearing was afforded by a "Notice of Proposed Issuance of Orders Authorizing Disposition of Component Parts and Terminating Facility License" published in the **Federal Register** on September 2, 1994, (59 FR 45738). No request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene was filed following notice of the proposed action.

Need for Proposed Action

In order to prepare the property for unrestricted access and use, the dismantling and decontamination activities proposed by UW must be accomplished.

Environmental Impact of the Proposed Action

All decontamination will be performed by trained personnel in accordance with previously reviewed procedures and will be overseen by experienced health physics staff. Solid and liquid waste will be removed from the facility and managed in accordance with NRC requirements. The UW staff has calculated that the collective dose equivalent to the UW staff and public for the project will be less than 0.06 person-sievert (6.02 person-rem).

The above conclusions were based on all proposed operations being carefully planned and controlled, all contaminated components being removed, packaged, and shipped offsite, and the existence of radiological control procedures will be in place that will help to ensure that releases of radioactive wastes from the facility are within the limits of 10 CFR Part 20 and are as low as reasonably achievable (ALARA).

Based on the review of the specific proposed activities associated with the dismantling and decontamination of the UW facility, the staff has determined that there will be no significant increase in the amounts of effluents that may be released offsite, and no significant

increase in individual or cumulative occupational or population radiation exposure.

The staff has also determined that the proposed activities will not result in any significant impacts on air, water, land, or biota in the area.

Alternative Use of Resources

The only alternative to the proposed dismantling and decontamination activities is to maintain possession of the reactor. This approach would include monitoring and reporting for the duration of the safe storage period. However, UW intends to use the area for other academic purposes.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, the staff consulted with the State of Washington, Division of Radiation Protection, Debra McBaugh (360/586-8945), regarding the environmental impact of the proposed actions. There was no objection to the conclusions reached in the environmental assessment.

Finding of No Significant Impact

Based upon the environmental assessment, the Commission concludes that the proposed action will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. Accordingly, the Commission has determined not to prepare an environmental impact statement for the proposed action.

For details with respect to the proposed action, see the licensee's letter dated August 2, 1994, which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street NW., Washington, DC 20555.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 26th day of April 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Seymour H. Weiss,

Director, Non-Power Reactors and Decommissioning Project Directorate, Division of Project Support, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 95-10727 Filed 4-28-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

Supplemental Environmental Statement; Availability

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice of availability.

SUMMARY: The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has issued a Supplement (NUREG-0498, Supplement 1) to the Final Environmental Statement related to the operation of Watts Bar Nuclear

Plant Units 1 and 2 (issued in December 1978). This supplement documents the NRC's latest review of the environmental issues at Watts Bar Nuclear Plant.

Single copies of the supplement will be provided to the Environmental Protection Agency, the applicant, Appropriate State, regional and local clearinghouses, and each individual or group that provided written comments on the draft supplement.

ADDRESSES: Other interested parties can obtain a copy of the supplement, for a fee, upon written request to the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, P.O. Box 37082, Washington, DC 20013-7082 or the Office of Administration, Distribution and Mail Service Section, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001.

An individual copy is available for inspection and/or copying for a fee in the NRC Public Document Room, 2120 L Street NW., Washington, DC 20555.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Scott C. Flanders, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, telephone (301) 415-1172.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The NRC issued the Final Environmental Statement concerning the operation of the Watts Bar Nuclear Plant in 1978. The NRC reexamined the issues associated with the environmental review before issuance of an operating license in order to document the observed changes in the environment and to evaluate the potential changes in environmental impacts that may have occurred as a result of changes in the Watts Bar Nuclear plant design or proposed methods of operations since the last environmental review. The NRC evaluated a broad scope of environmental topics including regional demography, land and water use, meteorology, terrestrial and aquatic ecology, radiological and non-radiological impacts on humans and the environment, socioeconomic impacts, and environmental justice. The staff concluded that there are no significant changes in the environmental impacts expected from the operation of the Watts Bar plant when compared to the impacts previously discussed in the NRC 1978 FES-OL.

The applicant's preoperational and operational monitoring programs were reviewed and found to be appropriate for establishing baseline conditions and

ongoing assessments of environmental impacts.

The staff also conducted an analysis of plant operation with severe accident mitigation design alternatives (SAMDAs) and concluded that none of the SAMDAs, beyond three procedural changes that the applicant committed to implement, would be cost-beneficial for further mitigating environmental impacts.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 21 day of April 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Scott F. Newberry,

Director, License Renewal and Environmental Review Project Directorate, Associate Director for Advanced Reactors and License Renewal, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 95-10610 Filed 4-28-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

[Docket Nos. 50-498 and 50-499]

Houston Lighting & Power Co., City Public Service Board of San Antonio, Central Power & Light Co., City of Austin, TX, South Texas Project, Unit Nos. 1 and 2; Notice of Issuance and Availability of NUREG

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has issued NUREG-1517, "Report of the South Texas Project Allegations Review Team." This report provides the results of the South Texas Project Allegations Review Team.

This team was formed to obtain and review allegations from individuals associated with three attorneys who had contacted congressional staff members from the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations of the U.S. House of Representatives' Committee on Energy and Commerce. The allegeders were employed in various capacities at Houston Lighting and Power Company's, et al., South Texas Project Electric Generating Station, and therefore, the allegations are confined to this site.

Copies of the report have been placed in the NRC's Public Document Room, 2120 L Street, NW., Lower Level, Washington, DC 20555 and at the Local Public Document Room for the South Texas Project, Units 1 and 2, Wharton County Junior College, J.M. Hodges Learning Center, 911 Boling Highway, Wharton, Texas 77488. Copies of the report may be purchased from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Post Office Box 37082, Washington, DC 20013-7082. GPO deposit account holders may charge their order by calling 202/275-2060. Copies are also available from the

National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 25th day of April 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Lawrence E. Kokajko, Team Leader,

Project Directorate, IV-1, Division of Reactor Projects III/IV, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 95-10609 Filed 4-28-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

[Docket Nos. 50-424-OLA-3 50-425-OLA-3; ASLBP No. 96-671-01-OLA-3]

In the Matter of: Georgia Power Company, et al. (Vogle Electric Generating Plant, Units 1 and 2); Evidentiary Hearing; Atomic Safety and Licensing Board

Before Administrative Judges: Peter B. Bloch, Chair, Dr. James H. Carpenter, Thomas D. Murphy.

Pursuant to 10 CFR 2.752, the public evidentiary hearing will continue at 9 am on May 15-18, 1995, at the Hearing Room (T 3 B45), Two White Flint North, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland.

The purpose of the hearing is to hear motions concerning the admissibility of evidence and to receive evidence concerning alleged misrepresentations about diesel generators at the Vogtle Nuclear Power Plant. The hearing is expected to continue at 1 pm in Augusta, Georgia on May 22 at a place to be designated. It will continue in session for several weeks, in Augusta, Georgia and in Rockville, Maryland until the hearing is completed.

For the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board.

Peter B. Bloch,
Chair.

[FR Doc. 95-10611 Filed 4-28-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 34-35642; File No. SR-NASD-95-11]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; National Association of Securities Dealers Inc.; Notice of Filing of Proposed Rule Change Relating to Requiring Use of the Facilities of a Registered Clearing Agency for the Clearance of Transactions in Corporate Debt Securities

April 24, 1995.

Pursuant to section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934

("Act"),¹ notice is hereby given that on April 10, 1995, the National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc. ("NASD") filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission ("Commission") a proposed rule change as described in Items I, II, and III below, which items have been prepared primarily by the NASD. The Commission is publishing this notice to solicit comments on the proposed rule change from interested persons.

I. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Terms of Substance of the Proposed Rule Change

The NASD is proposing to amend its Uniform Practice Code ("UPC") to add a new section 72 to require members that are participants in a registered clearing agency to use the facilities of a registered clearing agency for the clearance of securities transactions between members in corporate debt securities.

II. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Purpose of, and Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change

In its filing with the Commission, the NASD included statements concerning the purpose of and basis for the proposed rule change and discussed any comments it received on the proposed rule change. The text of these statements may be examined at the places specified in Item IV below. Summaries of the most significant aspects of such statements are set forth in sections (A), (B), and (C) below.

(A) Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Purpose of, and Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change

The NASD has observed that approximately thirty percent of all transactions in corporate bonds are being compared, cleared, and settled broker-to-broker or ex-clearing (*i.e.*, without the use of the facilities of a registered clearing agency). Clearing such transactions broker-to-broker is labor intensive, requires more time to complete, and results in more fails than transactions processed through a clearing agency. The labor intensive nature of broker-to-broker processing introduces errors into the process from keystroke errors, manual document handling errors, delivery errors, and payment errors. Because such broker-to-broker clearance is labor intensive, it also generally requires more time to complete. Finally, both of these factors increase the systemic clearance risk by

¹ 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1) (1988).